

Development Engineering Advisory Board Meeting
July 9, 2009
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Public Service Center
6th Floor Training Room

In attendance: Board members – Mike Bomar, Eric Golemo, John Graves, Jerry Nutter, Steve Wall; County staff – Ginger Blair, Pete Capell, Kevin Gray, Sue Stepan

Board members not in attendance: Greg Jellison, Tim Schauer

Visitors – David Bottamini, Norm Harker, Heath Henderson, Carolyn Heniges, Dean Shadix, Marty Snell

Administrative Actions

- Nutter started the meeting with introduction of the audience and board members.
- The June 4 meeting minutes were adopted without edits.
- The Parking Lot was reviewed; there are currently no items on the list.
- There was one new correspondence to review, from Travis Johnson. DEAB members had received the correspondence prior to the meeting. Johnson's issue regarded TIF credits for existing structures. Johnson resolved the issue with the County prior to the DEAB meeting. Stepan will ask Steve Schulte to send DEAB members an email with a summary of the resolution.

Subcommittee Update

- A. Development Engineering Processes Subcommittee (Chair – Schauer)
 - Schauer was not present, no updates.
- B. Community Development Process Team (Chair – Bomar)
 - Bomar reported that he has recruited members and the first meeting is scheduled for August 5, at 2:30 p.m., at the BIA offices. Meetings will recur on the first Wednesday of the month.
 - Members include Jaima Johnson, James Howsley, and Ann Anderson.
- C. Engineering Issues with Clark County Code (Chair – Golemo)
 - Golemo reported that he has recruited members and is planning to have a meeting soon.
 - Members include Travis Johnson, John Meier, Peter Tuck, Chad McMurray, George Embleton, and possibly Greg Jellison.

Stepan asked for the subcommittee chairs to let her know what the priorities will be for each group and what staff needs they may have.

Development Engineering Fees Updates

Stepan informed the group that revised Development Engineering fees were adopted at the June 16 hearing for preliminary and final engineering permits. New fees were also adopted for Community Development's Building Safety, Development Services, and Fire Marshal divisions. Fees were not adopted for development inspection due to a problem with the public hearing notice. A hearing will be held July 14 for the inspection fees.

The group reviewed the new Development Engineering fee table. Stepan pointed out that the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) approved 75% of the proposed increase. Therefore, the updated fees do not provide 100% cost recovery.

The group discussed how the BOCC's approval of 75% of the proposed increase was different than DEAB's recommendation of the fees being 75% cost recovery and 25% general fund subsidized. Additionally, the Community Development proposals that were adopted contained significant general fund subsidies.

The DEAB members discussed writing a letter to the BOCC to clarify their position. Capell reminded DEAB that the commissioners have a goal to convert to an hourly rate fee system by the first of the year and suggested bringing the subject up again during that process.

Stepan concluded by informing the group that Development Engineering has worked hard to reduce the levels of service and cut down on expenses and the original fee proposals reflected that. The next step will be to evaluate what level of service will be available at these new rates.

Proposed Utility Fees

Carolyn Heniges addressed the group regarding the proposed Utility Inspection fees that will accompany the proposed Development Inspection fees at the July 14 hearing. She explained that Public Works is trying to obtain cost recovery for these services and that these fees have not been increased since 1999.

Dean Shadix addressed the group and explained that the majority of the permits are for development, for tie-ins with sewer and water. The proposed fees were based on eight years of historical information on how much time is typically spent on jobs.

The proposed fees include a \$200 minimal permit fee which includes 15 ft length. The fees are incremental from there based on length. The fees are for 100% cost recovery for review and inspection and do not include program work.

The group discussed potential efficiencies, such as having just one inspector on the project performing all inspections and the potential effect on the cost of the service.

Heniges referred to the recent pooling of the inspectors and past practices of the Development Inspector performing utility inspections when feasible. She informed the group that these efficiencies were already calculated into the proposed fees.

The group discussed whether DEAB's recommendation for general fund subsidies applies to the Utility Inspection fees and whether there is a public benefit to warrant the subsidy. It was discussed that a utility going down a road will potentially serve more than just the subdivision putting it in.

Golemo made a motion to submit a letter at the fee hearing addressing the following points:

- Recommendation of 75% cost recovery and 25% general fund subsidy on utility fees for development related projects.
- Recommendation to look at efficiencies, such as stand alone utility permits vs. utility permits that are part of an already permitted development.
- Recommendation to look at efficiencies for review and inspection for county owned and regulated utilities (such as stormwater) vs. non-county owned ones.

The DEAB members voted; the motion did not receive majority approval.

Bomar made a motion for the item regarding cost recovery to be removed and a letter to be submitted with the remaining points.

The DEAB members voted, the motion was approved.

Bomar volunteered to draft the letter and circulate it to the members for approval via email. The letter will be submitted by a DEAB member at the July 14 hearing.

Public Comment

Norm Harker addressed the group and commented that the utility fees should have a cap.

The group discussed the point, with several members agreeing with Harker. Capell commented that when the county goes to hourly rates for fees, this issue would be addressed since the cost would be for actual time spent on the project.

David Bottamini addressed the group and expressed a desire to be involved in some of the subcommittees.

Meeting Minutes Prepared by: Ginger Blair

Reviewed by: Sue Stepan

Board Adopted: September 3, 2009

Development Engineering Advisory Board - Parking Lot Items					
#	PRIORITY*	SUBJECT	DATE REQUESTED	ORIGINATOR	ACTION
* Priorities: 1 = High/Important, 2 = Average, 3 = Low/long-term goal					